

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 20-25 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-19 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claim 1 was rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states, “the phrase ‘network information’ on page 12, line 5, is not disclosed in the specification.” See page 2, paragraph 2. Applicants have replaced the phrase “receive network information” with “provide network access,” which is supported, for example, at page 6, line 6. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 7-12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 and 24 was rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,313,211 issued to Tokuda, et al. (*Tokuda*). Claims 20, 22 and 24 have been canceled. Thus, the rejection of claims 20, 22 and 24 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that *Tokuda* does not anticipate claims 1, 7-12, 14, 16 and 18.

Claim 1 recites:

a wireless interface to receive wireless signals carrying network configuration data for the network appliance; and
circuitry coupled with the wireless interface to receive the configuration data and to configure a network interface to provide network

access according to the network configuration data received via the wireless interface.

Thus, Applicants claim an interface to receive configuration data and circuitry to configure a network interface using the configuration data.

Tokuda discloses wireless communications with an electronic organizer. See col. 6, lines 61-68. However, *Tokuda* does not disclose that the wireless signals received by a device are used to configure a network interface. Therefore, *Tokuda* does not anticipate the invention of claim 1.

Claims 7-11 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 7-11 are not anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 12 recites:

receiving wireless signals containing configuration information via a first interface;
decoding the wireless signals;
converting the decoded signals to machine-accessible configuration information; and
configuring a second network interface to operate based on the configuration information.

Thus, Applicants claim receiving wireless signals containing configuration information from a first interface and configuring a second interface to operate based on the received configuration information.

As discussed above, *Tokuda* does not disclose that the wireless signals received by a first interface are used to configure a second interface. Therefore, *Tokuda* does not anticipate the invention of claim 12.

Claims 14, 16 and 18 depend from claim 12. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 14, 16 and 18 are not anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Tokuda* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,032 issued to Linares, et al. (*Linares*). Claim 2 depends from claim 1. *Linares* is cited to disclose a rack-mounted appliance. Whether or not *Linares* discloses a rack-mounted appliance, nothing in *Linares* teaches or suggests that the wireless signals received by a device are used to configure a network interface. Thus, *Linares* cannot cure the deficiencies of *Tokuda*. Therefore, no combination of *Tokuda* and *Linares* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 2.

Claims 3, 19 and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Tokuda* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,187 issued to Blain (*Blain*). Claim 25 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 25 is moot. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and claim 19 depends from claim 12.

Blain is cited to disclose an Internet Protocol address. Whether or not *Blain* discloses an Internet Protocol address, nothing in *Blains* teaches or suggests that the wireless signals received by a device are used to configure a network interface. Thus, *Blains* cannot cure the deficiencies of *Tokuda*. Therefore, no combination of *Tokuda* and *Blains* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 3 and 19.

Claims 4-6, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Tokuda* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,877 issued to Charlier, et al. (*Charlier*). Claims

21 and 23 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 21 and 23 is moot.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1. Claims 13, 15 and 17 depend from claim 12.

Charlier is cited to disclose a personal digital assistant (PDA). Whether or not *Charlier* discloses a PDA, nothing in *Charlier* teaches or suggests that the wireless signals received by a device are used to configure a network interface. Thus, *Charlier* cannot cure the deficiencies of *Tokuda*. Therefore, no combination of *Tokuda* and *Charlier* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 4-6, 13, 15 and 17.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: JUNE 10, 2004


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200